

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
The Use of N11 Codes and other)	
Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements)	CC Docket No. 92-105
)	

REPLY COMMENTS OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS

SBC agrees with AT&T that N11 codes are among the “scarcest of resources under the Commission’s jurisdiction”¹ and should, therefore, be protected from frivolous assignment. Utilizing “344” as the three-digit number for the One Call Centers, however, is not the right alternative. While AT&T is correct in its assertion that there are more NPAs than N11 codes, its proposal to set aside an entire NPA for this purpose is ludicrous, impractical and flatly inconsistent with the Commission’s goal of preserving scarce numbering resources.² Setting aside the “344” Easily Recognizable Code (ERC) to implement the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002, 49 U.S.C. §§60101-60133 (Pipeline Safety Act) would require ILECs to take up to eight million telephone numbers out of commission, displacing millions of working telephone numbers that currently use the 344 NPA nationwide and forcing millions of end-users to change their telephone numbers. Plainly, such a result is antithetical to the goals of minimizing consumer confusion, conserving numbering resources, and ensuring that end-users can retain their telephone numbers.³

¹ AT&T Comments at 6.

² See California P.U.C. Comments at 6-7 and Michigan P.S.C. Comments at 3-4.

³ See 47 U.S.C. §251(b)(2) (requiring LECs to provide number portability to permit end-users that switch carriers to retain their telephone numbers).

SBC, like many other commenters, believes that the only reasonable alternative to assigning an N11 code is to establish a ten-digit mnemonic number, such as the 888-DIG-SAFE number currently in use in several states. For that reason, SBC urged the Commission to seek an amendment to the Pipeline Safety Act to allow for a ten-digit, nationwide, mnemonic toll-free number rather than a three-digit one as currently required under the statute.⁴ But absent a change in the statute, 811 (as recommended by the North American Numbering Council (NANC)) and 511 with an Interactive Voice Response service in the carrier's network (as detailed in SBC's Comments to this NPRM),⁵ are the only viable alternatives.

SBC agrees with BellSouth that carriers should be allowed discretion to determine the most efficient means of routing calls to a particular One-Call Center.⁶ Like BellSouth, SBC believes that routing based on the originating switch location will be the best method for it to route calls to the appropriate center. Because of number pooling and number portability, a customer's number may be in a different switch than the customer's NPA-NXX would designate. For example, when SBC "wins" a customer from a CLEC, SBC serves that customer out of the nearest central office switch. If SBC were to route calls from such a customer to the One-Call Center based upon the customer's NPA-NXX, which is still "assigned" to the customer's original provider, SBC could well route the call to the wrong center since CLEC's switches tend to serve different or broader areas than SBC's switches. For this reason, using the originating switch location as the routing mechanism is the best option for SBC to use to route calls to One Call Centers. Nevertheless, SBC recognizes that other carriers may prefer to use NPA-NXXs, or

⁴ SBC Comments at 1.

⁵ SBC Comments at 4-6.

⁶ BellSouth Comments at 10-11.

other methods, to route One Call Center traffic. Accordingly, the Commission should allow carriers the flexibility to utilize the most efficient or cost-effective approach for them.

Finally, the Commission should clarify that the assessment by carriers of non-“toll” charges on calls to One Call Centers is not inconsistent with the “toll-free number system” requirement in the Pipeline Safety Act.⁷ In order to deliver calls to the appropriate One Call Center, a carrier must translate the abbreviated One Call dialing code into the appropriate destination telephone number to properly route the call.⁸ And, for such calls to be to be “toll-free,” the destination telephone number must be either a local, non-IntraLATA toll or an 8YY Services number.⁹ But while such calls would be “toll-free” in both cases, they nevertheless might be subject to some charges if a One Call Center establishes a local number for receiving calls. In particular, if an end-user has measured rate service and its call gets routed to the One-Call Center via a local number, that end-user will be billed the measured rate for the duration of that local call, which still would be “toll-free.”¹⁰ If the Commission finds that the assessment of such charges is precluded by the “toll-free” requirement of the Act, the Commission must require One Call Centers to establish a toll-free number, such as an 8YY number, as the destination telephone number for call routing purposes.¹¹ If the Commission permits One Call Centers to have the option of establishing either an 8YY or local number as their destination telephone

⁷ Pipeline Safety Act, § 17 (requiring the establishment of “a 3-digit nationwide toll-free telephone number system to be used by State one-call notification systems”).

⁸ See CTIA Comments at 4.

⁹ In the NANC Report and Recommendations (NANC Recommendations), one assumption made by the NANC is that “[t]o be ‘toll-free,’ NANC Recommendations at 5.

¹⁰ Wireless carriers are faced with a similar challenge, as Cingular observes, in that wireless end-users “will receive toll-free access, but would still incur air-time charges when using wireless networks to access the One Call Center.” Cingular Comments at fn. 17.

¹¹ See CTIA Comments at 4.

numbers, the Commission should specifically state that carriers may charge end-users for local calls to the One Call Center without violating the “toll-free” mandate in the statute.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Jennifer Brown

Jennifer Brown
Gary L. Phillips
Paul K. Mancini

SBC Communications Inc.
1401 I Street NW 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: 202-326-8904
Facsimile: 202-408-8745

Its Attorneys

July 23, 2004